THEOLOGY

VOL. LIII SEPTEMBER, 1950 No. 363

Editorial

THE University of Oxford has one theological advantage, at least, over the University of Cambridge. It has a chair of Moral and Pastoral Theology, and therefore a professor who is committed by statute to occupy himself with, and to direct his teaching to, the more obviously practical aspects of divinity. It is curious that there are not in England more professorial chairs thus orientated, for it is a commonplace observation that the English are not speculative but pragmatic in their interests—in the sense that they want, first of all and perhaps last of all too, to know how a creed works out in practice and what it impels men to do.

Teachers of theology may often wish that they were surrounded by pupils more eager for the adventure of ideas, with more native aptitude for the high flights of speculation and metaphysical construction. A revival of theology would certainly bring with it a quickening of all the interests that are now deemed academic. All the same, an academic faculty of divinity is fortunate when its constitution contains an inescapable recognition of the fact that theology as a discipline is responsible for addressing itself to questions that contemporary men are or should be asking about their way of life, and, if not for speaking their language, at any rate for rousing their interest in its peculiar language.

We would add that the University of Oxford is fortunate in having Dr Demant as its present Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology. His inaugural lecture[1] shows how well he understands the task that is assigned to him. Pastoral theology has to unfold the permanent meaning of the pastoral office which the Lord has committed to His church and especially to the church's ministry. But it has also to take into account the conditions within which this office has at present to be exercised. Those conditions have, as Dr Demant says, during his own lifetime "undergone almost a revolution". Assumptions, which were reasonably made fifty years ago, no longer hold good. Methods, which were appropriate and effective then, are neither appropriate nor effective now. And the parochial clergy, who are most actively engaged in the pastoral ministry, are so harassed by pressure of work and by the multifarious demands which are made on them that they have little opportunity to take stock of the whole situation and decide how their methods should be revised. Dr Demant says that he would not presume from a university chair to offer specific advice to those who are struggling with the

[1] *The Responsibility and Scope of Pastoral Theology Today*. Clarendon Press. 2s.

contemporary difficulties in the field, but he can be assured that those who are struggling with those difficulties will gratefully welcome any illumination he can bring to bear upon their perplexities.

While he is expected to have chiefly in mind the pastoral office of the clergy, he intends to address his teaching "to a much wider set of students than those who are going to be ordained ministers of religion". We do not doubt that he will consider whether it should not be frankly and thankfully recognized that the pastoral office which used to devolve almost exclusively on the clergy has now become the responsibility of many other persons—doctors, psychiatrists, welfare officers, social workers, personnel managers, teachers, youth leaders, etc. Will it not be well, instead of lamenting that so much that was once the monopoly of the clergy has now passed to the hands of civilians, to aim at providing all who are called to these various forms of ministry with the spiritual and theological resources which they need at least as much as the ordained ministry? It is a further question whether those of them who are committed Christians should be given a ministerial status in the church.

As regards moral theology, Dr Demant has wise things to say about the criticisms that have been levelled against it as a distinct discipline, and about the ways in which it may be restored to its function of offering authoritative, and not merely scribal, guidance to Christians in all the involved decisions that they have to make in a disintegrated culture.

Moreover, the Regius Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology is now by statute charged with giving instruction in "ascetic and mystical theology" as well, and Dr Demant proposes to give this a large place in the scope of his teaching. There is certainly a demand, though it is often inarticulate, for fresh teaching about prayer and worship that will reckon both with the absence of the Christian ethos in society, and with the adverse climate in which laymen, and indeed clergymen too, must now cultivate the spiritual life.

Pre-Tractarian Revival

In 1857 Henry Venn published his sermon "The Treasure in Earthen Vessels" which he had preached in the parish church of St Marylebone at the consecration of Thomas Pelham as Bishop of Norwich. Appended to the sermon was "An Historical Sketch of the Revival of Evangelical Preaching in the Church of England", in which Venn says that, as far as he can discover, when Dr Benjamin Jenks, vicar of Harley and Kenby in Shropshire, died in 1724, there was no other clergyman in England known as an advocate of evangelical doctrines. He adds, however, that in South Wales there was Griffith Jones, the incumbent of Llanddowror. The Evangelical Revival in south-west Wales began with his ministry. Fourteen years before John Wesley was ordained, and twenty-five years before Whitefield became a priest, the movement had begun in Carmarthenshire and was to spread quickly to the neighbouring counties of

Cardigan, Brecon, Pembroke and Glamorgan. Soon other leaders became prominent, Daniel Rowlands, Howell Harris, Howell Davies, William Williams, all of whom were indebted to the influence and ministry of Griffith Jones.

One feature of the Evangelical Revival in south-west Wales which has not been recognized is the revival of the sacramental life of the church, and this is equally true of the movement in England. Many historians have associated the sacramental revival with the Tractarians, and the Evangelicals have been criticized for their lack of definite churchmanship and for their neglect of worship. This may be true of their successors, but it certainly is not true of the first three generations of the Evangelical Fathers. Indeed, it may be argued that the revival of worship in the Anglican church owes just as much to Cambridge as to Oxford, to Simeon and his circle as to the saints of Oriel! But most writers do not appear to have acknowledged this, and even so sympathetic an observer as Overton in his popular account, *The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century*, says that they made no attempt to carry out the church system in all its details, "and, above all, they placed, to say the least of it, those two Sacraments, which the Church expressly teaches . . . 'as generally necessary to salvation', on a far lower level than any unprejudiced student of the Prayer Book could possibly do." Many subsequent writers have accepted this point of view without verifying its truth, but the evidence disproves the statement, for we find that where there was an Evangelical minister there was built up a worshipping community, and that the Holy Communion service was given a central place in the life of the parish. The revival, too, must be judged not by present-day standards, but by the contemporary practice of the Church. Then, in most parishes, the usual celebrations of Holy Communion were three, Christmas Day, Easter Day and Whitsunday, and it was common to find many parishes without celebrations between Whitsun and Christmas. The Evangelicals introduced into their churches monthly celebrations; this was a step forward, a revolution of ordinary practice, a bridge between the eighteenth century and the middle nineteenth century, when weekly celebrations were slowly becoming an accepted feature of parochial life.

For the purpose of this essay our inquiry will be limited to the work of Griffith Jones and his contemporaries. Jones was ordained in 1708, and in 1716 his brother-in-law, Sir John Philipps of Picton Castle, presented him to the living of Llanddowror, where he remained until his death at the age of seventy-seven in 1761. His name will always be associated with the Circulating Schools which he began and which were his main concern for the last twenty years of his life. These itinerant Welsh schools were sent to parishes for three or four months and often remained for a second quarter. Their purpose was "to teach the Scholars to Read, to Sing Psalms, and to Pray with them Morning and Evening. . . . They were to exhort the Scholars to pray by themselves at home and (if they were able) to set up the Worship of God in the Families they belonged

to, and not to neglect Publick Worship on the *Lord's Day*."[1] Twice every day the masters catechized the children and taught them the principles and duties of religion, and in the evening they frequently taught the older people of the parish. In 1738 there were thirty-seven schools, by 1761 three thousand four hundred and ninety-eight had been set up, and more than one hundred and fifty thousand scholars had been instructed. It is impossible to exaggerate the influence these schools had in South Wales; not only did they help to revive the Welsh language, but they also revived the church in the parishes into which they were introduced, and reformed the conduct and manners of those who passed through them. Their ultimate purpose was not simply to instruct illiterate people but to save their souls: "The Design of them is formed to serve no other End, but the Honour of God, the Advancement of our Holy Religion, and the spiritual Welfare of our poor Fellow-creatures."[2] The Bible and the Catechism were the only textbooks, and there is no doubt that these Circulating Schools, together with the Methodist Revival, transformed the life of the nation and changed a people mainly concerned with material and secular things into one whose main interests for many generations afterwards centred in the parish church and chapel.

Griffith Jones published each year *Welch Piety*, an annual account of the work of his schools, and it is in these pages that we are enabled to see something of the revival of church life in Wales, and a new concern about the Holy Communion service. These references are of more value because they are incidental, for in the editions of *Welch Piety* which include testimonials from the parishes, the main interest is an account of the activities of the teachers, and any other information is in the nature of a postscript. The schools owe their origin to Jones's practice of catechizing his congregation after the second lesson at Evensong on Saturdays before his monthly sacrament Sunday. He was amazed at the ignorance of his parishioners, and it made him realize the need for their instruction. The money to maintain these schools began "with no other Fund, to defray the Expense of it, than what could be spared from other Occasions out of a small Offertory by a poor Country Congregation at the Blessed Sacrament; which being laid out first to erect one, and then a little time afterwards, two *Welch Schools*, answered so well that this gave Encouragement to attempt to setting up a few more".[3]

It is not surprising that the number of communicants increased, for Jones held that one of the purposes of his schools was "to prepare the Ignorant, to become devout *Communicants*, to celebrate with Reverence, Understanding, and Sincerity, the most *excellent* and *highest* Ordinance that ever was ordained in the *Church of Christ* upon Earth; where we are to commemorate his meritorious Death and Passion; whereby alone we obtain the Remission of our

[1] Griffith Jones, *Welch Piety: or The Needful Charity of Promoting the Salvation of the Poor. Being an Account of the Rise, Method, and Progress of the Circulating Welsh Charity Schools*, London, 1740, p. 20.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 29. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

Sins and eternal life; where the *Benefit is great*, if we receive that holy Sacrament worthily, and the *Danger great*, if we receive the same unworthily."[1]

Letters in *Welch Piety* describe the results of this work in the parishes of South Wales. Some of the clergy attached to the cathedral of St David testified that the value of the master's work was seen by the numbers who attended there every Sunday, and the monthly Communion Service.[2] John Thomas, Rector of Puncheston and Llanerchaur, Pembrokeshire, one of the earliest Evangelicals in this area, writes: "For my Churches have been so flocked to since the Schools have been set up, that there is scarce room sufficient for the Audience within doors and I can affirm that they appear very devout in publick Worship, very attentive under the Word, and greater Numbers do partake now constantly every Month of the holy Eucharist."[3] The curate of Gelligare, Glamorgan, soon identified himself with the movement and was one of the most ardent supporters of the Circulating Schools. In a letter written July 16, 1741, he tells Jones that his services are crowded: "We have now a Monthly Communion about us here in several Parish Churches, where, within a very few years past, it could hardly be administered as often as thrice a year, for want of Persons to receive it: But (thanks be to God) I hear there are *Six Score* Monthly Communicants in one of these Parishes at present, viz. *Eglwys Helen*; where not long since they wanted a *convenient* Number to minister the blessed Sacrament on one of three solemn Feasts in the Year. Am also informed that the Communicants increase monthly at *Bedwas*, *Mynydd yflwyn*, and *Bedwelltey*, in Monmouthshire and in several other Parishes distant from me."[4] Jenkin Jones, the vicar of Court Newydd in Llanllowel, Monmouthshire, wrote that, instead of the five or six communicants he generally had in Lanbadock two or three times a year, he had thirty each month.[5] An important witness is Marmaduke Gwynne, the squire of Garth, Breconshire. He had been converted through the preaching of Howell Harries, and this wealthy landlord devoted money and service to the movement. His daughter Sarah became the wife of Charles Wesley. He tells that in his area the churches were full and that " the Communicants at the blessed Sacrament of our dearest Lord's Supper are increased accordingly".[6] At Llangevelach, Glamorganshire, the vicar, John Price, tells that many who previously came to his services, but never stayed to communicate, are now monthly communicants;[7] and Benjamin Morgan, the curate of Llanllowddog and Llanpwmsaint, says that he presented a hundred and four persons for Confirmation. It is not without foundation that Griffith Jones claimed in the 1749 edition of *Welch Piety* that his schools had increased "the Number of *Communicants*, in several Parts of the Country".[8]

South Wales was richly provided with leaders, and there were few greater than Daniel Rowlands of Llangeitho, Cardiganshire. He was

[1] *Welch Piety*, London, 1754, p. 3. [2] *Ibid.*, London, 1742, p. 43.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 45. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 77. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 81. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 86.
[7] *Ibid.*, London, 1750, p. 84. [8] *Ibid.*, London, 1750, p. 8.

undoubtedly the greatest preacher of the movement, and David Jones, rector of Llangan, believed him to be the greatest preacher in Europe.[1] Rowlands was born in 1713 and became curate of Llangeitho in 1735, where he remained until he was ejected in 1763. His ejection was one of the most unfortunate episodes in the history of the church in Wales, and Bishop Burgess considered that the then Bishop of St David's had acted rashly and improperly in turning Rowlands out of the church.[2] Rowlands maintained to his death a great love for the church, and on his death-bed enjoined his son Nathaniel never to leave it, "because," said he, "there is a spark in the Prayer Book which will never be put out. Though it is hidden now, yet you may live to see it bursting out into a great flame."[3] The great service at Llangeitho was the monthly Communion service held on the first Sunday of each month, when over two thousand people communicated, and when Rowlands at times had as many as eight clergymen assisting him. In 1746 Dr Williams of Kidderminster records in his diary that he had met Rowlands at Trefecca, and "Mr Rowlands informed me that he had three thousand communicants, and that Davies had two thousand in Pembrokeshire",[4] whilst the Rev. John Davies of Sharncourt, who translated eleven of his sermons into English, writes in the preface "the stated number of communicants at the monthly sacrament, in his own church, is seldom less than 2,000, and sometimes more than 4,000". His ministry is one of the romances of the Church of God. People came to Llangeitho from all over south-west Wales; they even made the journey from places as far away as Bala and Anglesey, and "here were some Sundays . . . persons from almost every county in Wales".[5] George Whitefield was much struck by his experience at one of these services and testifies that the power of God at the sacrament, under the ministry of Mr Rowlands, was enough to make a person's heart burn within him.[6] People from the neighbouring districts would set out on Friday, some on horseback, others on foot, and join in procession to Llangeitho singing the hymns of Griffith Jones and William Williams of Pantycelyn. It was the glory of Rowlands's ministry to preach at and to conduct this service.

Similar scenes were witnessed in Pembrokeshire under the ministry of Howell Davies, and at Llangan where David Jones was rector. Little is known of the details of Howell Davies's life, except that he was intimately connected with Griffith Jones. He was educated at the latter's school at Llanddowror and was ordained in 1716 as Jones's curate. Pembrokeshire was the important sphere of his ministry, where for twenty years, until his death in 1770, he served and preached in New Chapel, Woodstock, Maunton and St Daniel, the two latter being chapels-of-ease in the rectory of Narberth. In

[1] W. Hughes, *Life and Letters of the Rev. Thos. Charles of Bala*, Rhyl, 1881, p. 24.

[2] E. Morgan, *Ministerial Records: or Brief Account of the Great Progress of Religion, under the Ministry of the Rev. D. Rowlands, of Llangeitho*, London, 1840, p. 85.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 86. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 47. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 63. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

each of these four chapels he celebrated the Lord's Supper every month.[1] Very seldom was the number of communicants less than two thousand, and often the churches had to be emptied to make room for a second and third congregation so that all could partake of the Sacrament.[1] Sometimes his listeners would number as many as four and seven thousand, and Davies had to preach in the open air so that all could hear him. In these little Pembrokeshire villages were reproduced scenes reminiscent of Coalpit Heath, the Foundery, Moorfields, Kennington Common and the Brickyard and Rose-green.

David Jones, for more than forty years rector of Llangan, owed his living to the influence of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon. Here, too, were witnessed scenes similar to those at Llangeitho. The vicar of Syston, Leicestershire, had opportunity as a young man of worshipping at Llangan, and in his biography of Jones describes the scenes at the monthly Communion service: "The surrounding country presented a most solemn and novel appearance. Multitudes upon multitudes were moving towards [the church] . . . in great seriousness and silence . . . some on horseback, and some on foot, from different quarters. . . . The large yard at Llangan vicarage was soon filled with horses, then the hedges were lined for a great distance with the many horses that were coming up in thick succession, being tied to them." He says that the appearance was like a large fair! "The church could not contain such a vast concourse of people; a great part of the congregation stood in the churchyard near a window, through which Jones preached to them from the pulpit."[2] So great were the congregations that Jones always had the assistance of other clergymen at the administration of the Sacrament. As the church was full of communicants he used to walk from the chancel to the aisles administering as he moved along, taking one side as he went down, and the other as he returned. And all these scenes took place long before Tract 90 or the Assize Sermon!

Another outstanding leader was Howell Harris, one of the most dramatic and dynamic figures in Welsh history. Although in some ways he precipitated the events which led to the Methodists breaking away from the church, he remained a convinced churchman, and did all in his power to keep his associates within the church. One of the greatest preachers of the century, an ardent revivalist and social reformer, he dominates the scene of Welsh life for fifty years. Harris was converted at a service of Holy Communion at Talgarth church on Whit-Sunday, May 25, 1735. On the Sunday before Easter the vicar read the exhortation from the Communion service appointed when people are negligent in its observance, and in his sermon said, "If you are not fit to come to the Lord's Table, you are not fit to come to church, you are not fit to live, you are not fit to die." Harris was impressed by the solemnity of this warning and meditated much upon these words. At the celebration on Whit-Sunday he

[1] Enwogion y Ffydd: neu, Hanes Crefydd y Genedl Gymreig, London, n.d., p. 210.

[2] E. Morgan, *Ministerial Records: or Brief Account of the Great Progress of Religion under the Ministry of the Rev. D. Jones, Llangan, Glam.*, London, 1841, pp. 180-8.

found peace with God. Charles Wesley in his *Journal*, May 8, 1740, gives this account of Harris: "He declared his experience before our Society. O what a flame was kindled! Never man spake, in my hearing, as this man spake. What a nursing-father has God sent us! . . . These words broke out like thunder, 'I now find a commission from God to invite all poor sinners, justified or unjustified, to His altar; and I would not for ten thousand worlds be the man that should keep any from it. There I first found Him myself. That is the place of meeting.'" This experience coloured his whole life and he always gave this service a central place in his devotions and practice. Soon afterwards, on August 16, 1735, he wrote to his vicar that, together with some friends, "finding our ignorance in the heavenly road and our weakness to be great, it made me presume to let you know a very great desire we have of communicating oftener —if your discretion thinks fit, once a month. That being with God's blessing, and your pious endeavour, joined with our observation and performance of our part the most and only effectual means to kindle this heavenly spark, which otherwise we experience is in danger to cool and die."[1] He became an itinerant evangelist, and the result of his work was summed up by him, "Family worship was set up in many homes, and the churches so far as I had gone were crowded, and likewise the Lord's Table."[2] At this time the Moravians, under the leadership of James Hutton, were renouncing the Sacraments and Harris joined with Charles Wesley in combating this heresy. Although he offered himself for ordination many times no bishop would accept him, and he rejected the offers of ordination from Nonconformist bodies.

One of his most successful experiments, based on the Moravian settlements at Herrnhut and Fulneck, was the establishment at Trevecca of a community of godly men and women. When William Davies became the new vicar he wrote to him asking to have the Communion service administered once a month instead of the four times a year that had been the custom of the parish. The new incumbent readily agreed, and began the monthly service on the first Sunday of February, 1764. Harries wrote about this service: "This was a great day indeed; the first time that we had the communion according to our wish and request."

A consideration of the available evidence shows that the generally accepted view is quite wrong. The Evangelicals were not simply preachers, men who exalted the pulpit and minimized the sacramental life of the Church, but in an age when many churches had Holy Communion administered on the three great festivals only, they strove to make their congregations attend a monthly celebration. It was not a fortuitous accident that people came in great numbers on these occasions; they were made to realize that this was their privilege and that it was an essential part of their duty as churchmen. They took great care to prepare their people for the

[1] Hugh J. Hughes, *Life of Howell Harris*, Newport and London, 1892, p. 24.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

service. Rowlands always had a service of preparation on the Saturday before the monthly Communion service, and Jones of Llangan made a point of holding a preparatory meeting at Pencoed before Sacrament Sunday. Here he prepared them for the coming feast; he tried to get to know their spiritual state and the progress they were making in their devotional life, so that he might keep out what was deemed evil, and support and strengthen what was considered good. And Griffith Jones maintained that it is not "the least Part of a Clergyman's Duty, to confer with his People in order to prevent them from the Danger of receiving unworthily, and indeed to save himself from the Guilt of unworthily dispensing the sacred Elements."[1]

These men not only preached for conversions and decisions, they realized that their congregations had to be built up in the Christian life, and so they emphasized the importance of worship. One of the main criticisms they made against so many of the parish priests was that "the beautiful Liturgy was irreverently gone through."[2] It is no coincidence that the first and greatest revival of Rowlands's ministry began when he was reading the obsecration in the Litany, "By thine Agony and Bloody Sweat". Morgan, criticizing the way so many clergymen conduct the service says that Jones of Llangan by his humble and devout manner induced the people to pray with him, and he adds that the services there "tended much to remind one of heaven itself". There are many passages in *Welch Piety* which show how the Circulating Schools had improved the standards and performance of public worship. Thus Benjamin Morgan, the perpetual curate of Llanllawddog, writes that "the decent Appearance every Sunday of so many modest Children, their reverent Behaviour in the House of God, their exact Conformity to the Orders and Ceremonies of our Church, is, I assure myself, the godliest Light this Part of the World can boast of in any kind".[3] One other witness may be quoted, Peter Maurice, Rector of Llanllechid: "many of them make the regular Responses at Divine Service; a Thing not known before in this Parish; they also sing Psalms very well while the Master assists them, and will in a little Time be able to do it without any Instructor", and the vicar of Cardigan writes that the Master has worked at night "in improving Adult Persons in Psalmody"; and so it could be continued.

If any critic is still inclined to believe that these early Evangelicals neglected worship, let him consider two sentences of Griffith Jones: "If *divine Worship* was once revived, *Christianity* in general would revive with it; but when it is neglected, *Religion* is impaired, if not quite vanished already"; and another from the first edition of *Welch Piety*: "They must add the conscientious and constant Use of all the Means of Grace, to serve as Buckets to fetch living Waters from

[1] G. Jones, *A Letter to a Clergyman: Evincing the Necessity and indicating the Method of Instructing Poor and Ignorant People to read the Holy Scriptures in their Native Language*, London, 1745, p. 7.

[2] Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 286; *cf.* Owen, *A Memoir of the Rev. Daniel Rowlands*, London, 1840, p. 49.

[3] *Welch Piety*, London, 1760, p. 20.

the Wells of Salvation, to enrich the Roots, or the Fruits will wither and fall away before they are ripe."[1] Thus he sums up the deepest sentiments of these reformers and reflects their attitude to worship. They knew that it could be neglected only to the danger of the souls of their people, and so they did everything in their power to introduce them to the living worship of the church of which sacramental worship is the consummation. They did for Wales what Walker, Henry Venn, Robinson, Haweis, Romaine, Jones, Cecil, Woodd and others did for England. The revival of church life began with them, and the church did not have to wait for the Tractarians to recall it to worship. The early Evangelicals anticipated them by at least half a century.

GWYN ROGERS.

The Incarnation and the Principles of Evangelism

THE publication of the report "Towards the conversion of England", the establishment of a Church Information Board, the "Christian Commando Campaigns", and the recent Mission to London, while giving evidence of the Church's concern for the problem of communication in the modern world, at the same time prompt reflection on the principles of specifically Christian evangelism. Is the primary vocation of the Church to live or to explain? May all methods at the disposal of the modern propagandist be used legitimately by the Church, or are there distinctive, unique methods of evangelism laid upon the Church by the very nature of her being, to which she must remain obedient, and which preclude her from using others? Answers to these questions will be conditioned by one's conception of what the Church is. If the Church is regarded as a kind of club which "church-going" brings into existence, or as an organization for the diffusion of Christianity, then perhaps there need be no inhibitions about the agencies used in the way of self-expression and advertisement. But if the Church is not a club nor an organization but a living organism, the Body of Christ, in essential continuity with Him, living a life not primarily her own, but Christ's life in her through the operation of the Holy Spirit, and if the distinctive calling of the Christian as a "member of Christ" is the "imitation of Christ", not in the sense of setting out to copy a blackboard example, but in the New Testament sense of sharing mystically in the life of the risen, ascended, glorified Christ, then the life of the Church is, fundamentally, her only "explanation", and there can be only one appropriate method of Christian evangelism, the method of the Christ the Head of the Body, the incarnational method of God. This article is an attempt to relate the question of Christian evangelistic method to the nature and implications of the historic Incarnation.

I. In the movement of John the Baptist Jesus recognizes God's sovereign activity as having reached its penultimate stage, and He identifies Himself with it in an act of obedience and is baptized.

[1] *Welch Piety*, London, 1740, p. 61.

It is noteworthy that throughout His ministry Jesus connects insight into the nature of John's work as the activity of God with the ability to see in His own mission the very same activity having come now to completion. Significantly frequent in this connexion are the references back to John the Baptist when questions are put to Him about His person and work. These are never answered by way of verbal self-identification, but by pointing to other manifestations of God's activity (often those evident in the coming of John the Baptist) in such a way that His questioners are invited, nay summoned, to identify not only these manifestations as being verily of God, but also their relation to Himself and His own movement. In the address to the crowd following the reply to John's query: "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" we have the statement that those who heard John and were baptized "justified God", and to have rejected the baptism of John is to have rejected for oneself the "intent of God" (*ἡ βουλὴ τοῦ θεοῦ*, Luke vii, 30). Again, following the Transfiguration there is the important discussion about the coming Elijah, in which Jesus identifies Himself and His work not directly and explicitly, but by proclaiming John as the Elijah to come, and indicates further that if men have put to death him who is to precede the Messiah, it is all the more likely that they will put to death the immediate successor of the Elijah (Mark ix, 11-13; *cf.* Matthew xvii, 13). Perhaps the most significant of these references back to John the Baptist, for our purpose, is that contained in the reply given to the question of the religious leaders during the last week in Jerusalem: "By what authority doest thou these things?" This direct question about the nature of His person and work is answered by Jesus in a manner characteristic of His whole ministry—*i.e.*, by insisting that His questioners alone may properly answer their own question, "I will ask of you one question . . . the baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men, answer me" (Mark xi, 30). In other words: "Did you see in John's movement the very activity of God, and were you ready to face His demands? If you were not, if you saw there merely another reform movement and not primarily the activity of God through His prophet, then you are necessarily precluded from seeing the significance of my movement, for it too is the activity of God, but come to completion. If you cannot recognize the activity of God when it is about to come to a head, you cannot, as the posing of the question itself implies, recognize it when it has come to a head, for a process completed is a new thing" (Mark xi, 27-33). "The law and the prophets were until John; from that time the gospel of the Kingdom of God is preached" (Luke xvi, 16), or, as the Fourth Gospel puts it: "The law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (John i, 17).

The nature of these replies, with their invitation to reflect again on the meaning of the Baptist's coming, and boldly to draw the conclusion from it, suggests that the status and function of Jesus in the Kingdom of God were such that they were not capable of exact unequivocal verbal authentication by Him, but were the content of God's revelation, accessible only to those "able to receive", the

humble and the childlike, those with eyes to see and ears to hear, to whom is given the "secret of the kingdom" (Mark iv, 11). His messiahship is, by its very nature, self-authenticating to those who can "discern the signs" of its presence. Any merely verbal proclamation of it would be hopelessly inadequate, if not an implicit act of filial disobedience. Hence direct questions about His own person are always returned to the questioner, who alone is called upon to answer. Apart from the questions considered above, there are the direct queries of John the Baptist, Caiaphas and Pilate. To John Jesus replies, characteristically, by inviting him to recognize in the happenings of His ministry the signs that the promised messianic age has arrived (Matthew xi, 3-6). The replies to Caiaphas and Pilate may conveniently and revealingly be considered together. The more usual reading of the reply in Mark to the high priest's "Art thou the Christ the son of the Blessed?" is "I am" (*ἐγώ εἰμι*, Mark xiv, 62), and this positive and direct asseveration, if authentic, stands out in isolation from all other replies of Jesus to similar questions. The parallel passages in both Matthew and Luke give replies which are certainly more in line with what would appear to have been the method of Jesus as a whole. Matthew has "Thou hast said" (*σὺ εἶπας*, xxvi, 64), and Luke, "If I tell you, ye will not believe, and if I ask you, ye will not answer" (*ἐὰν ὑμῖν εἴπω, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε. ἐὰν δὲ ἐρωτήσω, οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε*, xxii, 67-68), and further, "Ye say that I am" (*ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι*, Luke xxii, 70). Some important MSS, however, θ fam.[13] 543, 472, 565, 1071, etc., read at Mark xiv, 62, "Thou hast said that I am" (*σὺ εἶπας ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι*). This may perhaps be the right reading since, apart from being fully in keeping with the method of Jesus, revealed in the Synoptic Gospels as a whole, in a matter of fundamental importance to the conception of His mission as obedient Servant, it is difficult to understand why Matthew should change a direct answer of this nature to an indirect, especially when on other occasions he has made less explicit words of Jesus about Himself quite unmistakably direct (*e.g.*, Matthew xvi, 13, xxvi, 2; *cf.* Mark viii, 37, xiv, 1).

How then may we define what might be termed the "messianic method" of Jesus? We need to examine first the Baptism and the Temptation. At His baptism Jesus is finally conscious of His unique intimate Sonship, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased" (Mark i, 11). These words imply that His Sonship is not only a status but a vocation; it involves a mission, to bring men from sin to share in and with Him the knowledge of God as Father. The exact methods of this mission become clear only after Temptation. He is conscious of what He is, before He knows precisely what He must do. There is the Temptation to put His Sonship to the test, rather than to trust in obedience, and there is the Temptation to unambiguous self-identification by worldly means. These temptations are put aside as Satanic, and the method actually chosen is twofold, and may be described as "kerygmatic" and "didactic", to proclaim and to gather. It is first to proclaim that the agelong activity of God as King in calling, commanding, redeeming and in-

gathering an Israel has come to a head in His own time and brought Him with it,[1] and then to gather to Himself the responsive. God's Israel purpose is achieved in Him; He is Himself Israel, and Israel's ingatherer. It is in this method of kerygma and didache that He submits in obedience to the Father's will for Him, and it was in kerygma and didache that the Apostolic Church imitated the obedience of Christ. The Messiah of God is revealed in the manner of God, in the Word now become flesh. The messiahship of Jesus is such that its being is its proclamation; He cannot proclaim it by placard, since this would be to test the reality of it rather than to trust in obedience.[2] God in Him proclaims, and God in Him gathers. The temptation which recurs to Jesus is the temptation to depart from this way—*e.g.*, after Cæsarea Philippi in the words of Peter: "Far be it from thee, Lord; this shall never be unto thee" (Matthew xvi, 22), a temptation which once again is put aside as satanic, and finally at Gethsemane: "remove this cup from me" (Mark xiv, 36).

The confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi ends the first, kerygmatic, phase of the ministry of Jesus, and permits the second, didactic, phase to begin. In the first phase the acts and words of Jesus are *δυνάμεις* of the kingdom, signs of its presence which make a claim on the recognition of men. No "sign" can be given to this generation other than that which is being given, Jesus Himself (Mark viii, 12).[3] Of the kerygmatic method of the parabolic teaching of Jesus Dr W. R. Matthews writes: "It is a grave misunderstanding of the ministry of Jesus to imagine that He wished to inaugurate a 'mass-movement' or that He had anything in common with the propagandist, who by means of catch-phrases and 'slogans', bends crowds to his purposes, which they do not grasp. The intention of the parables was, partly at least, not elucidatory, but selective. Jesus spoke in public words which gave a hint of the existence of the mystery of the Kingdom, and an indication of its value for those who had 'ears to hear'. For most, we cannot doubt, the parables remained striking utterances which were soon forgotten, but in some they aroused the thirst for fuller knowledge, and these were they who passed into the Kingdom, 'took it by force', becoming members of that inner circle to whom was given to know the mystery"(*Christ*, p. 26). The characteristic refrain of the kerygmatic period, "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear", occurs chiefly after the parables of the Kingdom. The responsive are indeed blessed (Matthew xi, 16-17). What Jesus is and does is for them the meaning of the Kingdom. Jesus is *αὐτοβασιλεία* (Origen, *in Matt.* xiv, 7); "in the gospel the

---

[1] *Cf.* R. Otto, *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn*, p. 80: "Nicht Jesus 'bringt' das Reich—eine forstellung, die Jesu ganz fremd ist—sondern des Reich bringt ihn mit."

[2] *Cf.* E. Brunner, *Revelation and Reason*, p. 289: "The task of Jesus was not to *teach* the Christ, but to *be* the Christ."

[3] *Cf.* R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, p. 5: "Aber was sind die Zeichen de Zeit? Er selbst! Sein Auftreten und Wirken, seine Verkündigung!"

Kingdom of God is Christ Himself" (Tertullian *adv. Marcionem* iv, 33).[1]

The method of Jesus in this pre-Cæsarea Philippi period is kerygmatic, and therefore it elicits response, a response which is fraught with eternal consequences. No unfair burden is here being laid upon men, because the method of God in revelation is such that men ought to recognize it: "The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, something greater (*πλεῖον*) than Jonah is here" (Matthew xii, 41). The *δυνάμεις* are decisive proclamations that the powers of the new age are now being exercised; the parables of the Kingdom are a challenge to men to put themselves in the situation in the parable, and to see there God addressing them: "What think ye?" "What man of you?" "What woman?" "Who of you?" etc.

At Cæsarea Philippi God's final revelation of the nature of the Kingdom is responded to by Peter's confession of the Messiahship. of Jesus. Henceforward we have the didactic phase of the ministry. The proclamation to Israel has been made, and Israel has rejected Him, but Peter's confession clears a site, as it were, upon which the new Israel can be built. The works and words of Jesus are now not so much kerygmatic as didactic, a way of instructing the disciples in the life of the Kingdom, and the life of the Kingdom is to be imitation of Him by way of sharing in His patience and humility and sufferings. Men enter the Kingdom by being joined to Him. With the twelve, chosen "that they might be with Him", the new Covenant is ratified in His sacrificial self-giving in death. In Jesus Israel's vocation to the willing obedience of God is perfectly fulfilled; the yoke of Israel He takes upon Himself, and He asks His followers to bear it, not alone, but in and with Him. That is the ease and comfort of it (Matthew xi, 29-30). The "ethical teaching" of Jesus is the way of life in the Kingdom, for those who are joined to Him. In that context alone it has relevance, because in Him it was perfectly obeyed. Men enter the Kingdom, by "learning Christ".

II. The Christian, as a "member of Christ", is called to one thing: to live the life of Christ in His Body, the Church, which he does through the Spirit of God, "who takes of the things of Christ and reveals them". Christ is completed in His Body (Colossians i, 24). He, and those in Him, together form the "totus Christus". The function of the Church in the world is, therefore, Christ's function, and it has the same twofold aspect of (*a*) the kerygmatic proclamation of the Gospel of God—*i.e.*, the pointing of men to the place where God confronts man with Himself as a Person in the historic Incarnation and the historic Atonement; and (*b*) the didactic ingathering of the members of the Body in the Sacraments. The Church is to preach the Gospel to all men, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear, but this is not her entire activity; it

[1] *Cf.* a saying of Jesus (in Origen): "He who is near me, is near the fire, he who is far from me is far from the Kingdom." Quoted by Daniel Rops, *Jésus en son temps*, p. 18.

has as its specific end the act of repentance and faith, which is the prelude to "edification", to being built into the Body. The work of the Church is therefore incomplete if there is exclusive concentration on the first activity of kerygma, "preaching to the converted", and neglect of didache, the instruction in Christ through the liturgy. The evangelistic way of the Church, as the Body of Christ, must conform to the way of the Head of the Body; in kerygma and didache, together, she surrenders herself to Him, that His will may be done in her.

The kerygma can be presented only in a kerygmatic way. The Agape of God cannot be recognized as such by men, if they are invited to the way of Eros, or, at least, not until there has been a drastic process of unlearning.[1] The dangers of some forms of modern evangelism are that they are based upon the assumption that Christianity is by nature a mass-movement, certain at any moment of universal acceptance, if only it be "effectively" presented, and being a mass-movement may legitimately use whatever "popular" methods lie to hand. But Christianity can only be "effectively" popularized by disguising it as a mere moralism, or by ministering to the motive of advantage or interest in some form or other, and in either procedure there is inevitably a process of inoculation which renders men immune from the approach to Christianity at its centre.

Furthermore, there are limits to the "translatability" of the Christian vocabulary, just as there are to the scientific. To an age, for example, which thinks of sin in terms either of ignorance or imperfection, the Christian doctrine of redemption from sin can have no real meaning or relevance, and such words as "sin", "atonement" and "redemption" become foreign terms. In such circumstances the Church can only present her meaning in the manner of Christ, by being it. The Messiahship of Jesus was revealed in such a way as to invite a commitment in humility to His person, and in that act only was the meaning to be found. The kerygma is a call to repentance and faith, not an explanation, because repentance and faith alone lead to the meaning. The meaning is to be found in the life of the Body, and pre-eminently in the Eucharistic action of the Church where the Head and the Body are one.

If the method of the Church's evangelism is the method of Christ, in kerygma and didache, the temptation of the Church is the temptation of Christ, her Head, to turn from the path of obedience to the Father's way, to put to the test, rather than to trust. Kerygma and didache are both laid upon the Church, and if when considering

[1] *Cf.* K. E. Kirk, *The Vision of God,* pp. 142-3: " 'God-centredness' cannot be evolved from self-centredness; the self-centred soul must undergo conversion to the roots before it can find a new centre in God. The slightest condonation of self-centredness is no less than treason to the ideal of self-forgetfulness; and it is hard to believe that the Lord . . . could for a moment have compromised on a matter so vital as this. To accept such a solution, in fact, would be to acquiesce in the belief not that Jesus contracted, for the moment, the scope of His demands, but that he popularized them by appealing to false motives; that He accommodated and betrayed the purity of the gospel in its most sacred aspects to win adherents; that He debased the divine currency in the traffic of God with man."

the problems of evangelism in the modern world, we tend to concentrate solely on the "methods" of the former, we need to re-emphasize the place of the latter, because it is there, after all, that the distinctive work of the Church is done. The Church is Messianic in being and function; her way is the way of the Messiah Himself.

E. J. Tinsley.

Jesus and History

The modern mind is obviously baffled by the claim of the Christian faith to rest on and revolve round events in time. It asks in tones of sincere mystification how eternal truth—the love of God or human victory over moral evil—is anywise dependent for its hold upon our intelligence on actual incidents in the past. Is there not even grossness in the idea? If the Gospel is in itself true, no fusion or coalescence of it with special portions of the time-series can make its truth any less or more. Faith is the soul's adhesion to the living God; why then perplex the simplicity and candour of its attitude by insisting that the attitude in question is one which necessarily implies a specifically intellectual posture towards the events of history? Why not rather concede that the protest against this is at bottom a religious one, as demanding only that honest men should be encouraged to remain in fellowship with the Church while yet as critics of tradition they suspend judgment on the historicity of such events as the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ? There are some who would go further and refuse to implicate religion with history at all. This attitude may be due to a quickened sense of the obstacles in the path of the historian who aims at certainty, and has perforce to be satisfied with probability. It is widely believed that Gospel criticism has evacuated our knowledge of Jesus of all certainty. Why not then substitute the ideal Christ for the historic Jesus? Lift the dead hand of the past from the Christian religion and cut loose from the entanglements and uncertainties with which the Church would strangle the religious aspirations of ordinary people. Now, although it is often argued that the origin of this point of view is historical, it is the belief of the writer that in the last resort it is philosophic. Philosophy has always tended to regard historic fact as negligible. Truth as such is timeless; from the final point of view the contingencies of the world-process leave it wholly unaffected.

As a general idea this can be traced back to ancient speculation. The Greek view of things had no place for what we call history or progress. It aimed at dealing solely with the permanent essence of the world, and it accepted mathematics as the perfect form of knowledge and as exclusively competent to guide the mind to cognition of that which really is. We must remember that Greek thought set out from the study, not of man—who is made for history—but of physical nature. Hence the successiveness of human events was sternly reduced in significance to the second or third rank; it was something proper only to the realm of *γένεσις*, the sphere of change

and incalculable variety, which can never satisfy the properly metaphysical interest. Yet the Greek mind could not fail utterly to devise its own equivalent for the modern conception of history as a teleological process on the great scale. And this equivalent is found in the idea of a continuous cycle of existence, with alternating periods of evolution and dissolution. All human events, it was held, are repeated time after time, endlessly. Thus for Plato the wheel of generation is eternal, as it had been also apparently for the Pythagoreans; and in Aristotle we meet with the strongly marked principle that the process of the world of generation is a series of transitions without beginning or end. In the same way the Stoics held that the world course is reversible, the original state being perpetually restored. Conceptions of this kind are constantly being revived, and the very persistence of the theory means that it is dealing with what appears a real difficulty to thought. It is hard to grasp the reality of the process and admit a real increase and growth in the content and significance of the world. The force of facts compels to the admission that the world really progresses, really contains more than it did of the quality in terms of which the progress is formulated, that its Becoming involves a progressive increase in Being. But in spite of the avowal of dynamical principles, the statical tendency to regard the amount of Reality as stationary irresistibly reasserts itself. The actual fact of growth cannot be denied, but its significance may be disputed. And so it is asserted to be merely apparent; it is really only the manifestation of the great Cycle, which reels off the appointed series of events in precisely the same order for ever and ever. It is therefore a mere illusion to fancy that the total content of the universe changes.

In sharp contrast to this idea that progress is unmeaning we have the message of the Hebrew prophets. To them the world owes the idea of a real history of things, a progress in time. No one would gravely contend that the Hebrews possessed the peculiar charism of the metaphysician. In spite of their temperament, however, they have contributed certain well-marked elements of truth which must find a place in any sound philosophy. At each point they are seen to be foes of abstraction, bent unwaveringly on that mental attitude of concrete synthesis which insists on the undivided unity of life. In proof we have only to recall their profound sense of the vital conjunction and co-operation of nature and spirit, the oneness of man's experience, the connexion of sin and death; which last is always held to have a moral meaning. And it is the same intensely concrete view which is implicit in the prophetic doctrine that human progress is real because its core and spring are ethical. History is a moral operation. The Kingdom of God is coming on earth. A redemptive purpose is being executed on the grand scale and will throw its results far on into the coming ages. The fortunes of Israel are, in the last resort, the fortunes of mankind. If we like we may put this principle into language far enough away from the Old Testament, although natural to us, by saying that the conception of reality it implies is not merely statical, but dynamic. Reality, in

other words, is not *per se* complete, finished, moveless; it is patient of increase and development and marches forward to a goal. It is a time process, or at all events such a process is embraced within it. It is a scene of change, in which new facts emerge; yet not as the Greeks held of change which is finally unreal and non-significant. Rather its plastic movement is laden with ultimate and eternal meaning.

Unfortunately the tendency has been to interpret religion more from the Greek than the Hebrew point of view. Spinoza, for example, argues that nothing else is needful for salvation except the knowledge of the Eternal Son of God, that is, of the Divine wisdom; so that if unquestionably it is advantageous to be aware of the historic Christ, yet it is in no way necessary, since the Divine life in man of which he is the symbol has come to abundant manifestation elsewhere. Kant follows in this line, contending that faith in the ideal Christ, in whom God-pleasing manhood has been exemplified, is the true faith which saves the soul and makes it blessed inwardly; and in perfect consistency with this, notwithstanding a willing admission that the ideal took shape and form in the historic Jesus, he does not hesitate to assert that the question whether Jesus' fulfilment of the ideal was complete and sinless is comparatively unimportant. Fichte crowns the series by the declaration that it is contrary to the Christian religion to demand faith in the historic Jesus. If a man is in fact united to God, his duty is not to be perpetually going back upon the way to such union, but to live in the thing.

A great deal of contemporary thought upon religion reflects this attitude of mind towards the historic Jesus. It has been said that contingent historical truths can never become proof of necessary truths of reason. And there are some who argue that the persistent clinging to the past is reducing Christianity to a museum piece. Certain types of modernism, pleading for the independence of faith and history, claim that the true refuge from the dangers of Gospel criticism is the merging of self in the universal Church as the brotherhood of aspiring men. Some have turned to mysticism as an escape from the apparent meaninglessness and uncertainty of history.

What answer can we give to this? What defence can be made of the Gospel inwoven by unbreakable strands of living fibre? In the first place, it is to be remembered that the religious life of man has always moved upward, not by the influence of abstract conceptions, however rich and versatile, but by the power of great personalities. Each vast movement starts with a man. It rises into strength because an idea and a mind have become fused in one—the thought embodied in a soul, the soul dedicated to the thought and acting only in its service. This is unquestionably how concrete history has proceeded from phase to phase; it has moved by incessant new beginnings; and if the axioms of a mechanical psychology break down helplessly before a Paul, a Luther, or a Wesley, acknowledging their inability to deal with the original and inscrutable factors these names represent, it is hard to see how they can expect to cope with the incomparable life of Jesus. And to crown all, it has been found

that *a priori* notions of relativity are extinguished in Jesus' presence. They are broken by redemption as an experience as of old Samson broke the restraining withes. The men who followed Christ in Palestine and learnt to call Him their Lord, those who in every time have felt the sweep of His power and the renewing impetus of His Spirit—all these are somehow aware that in Jesus we touch the supreme moral reality of the universe. They are aware of this; and unavoidably they have proceeded to make unique assertions regarding this unique person. And whatever be the defects of these assertions in language or conception they at least proclaim the infinitude of Jesus, and the intrinsically hopeless character of all efforts to compute His place who is

> the star to every wandering bark
> Whose worth's unknown, although his height be taken.

The assertion that nothing in the past can be vital to a religion which demands a present object is at first sight impressive. But only at first sight. On these terms life may be spiritually enriched by Jesus Christ as by Socrates, but in no other sense. Ideas or principles may be taken from the Gospel provided we renounce the facts. If Jesus is historical, He can only be a dead or dying influence of the past. How often this attempt has been made to put Jesus firmly into his own age; to hold Him there a prisoner chained by time's limitations, a figure dimmer always and more distant with the lapse of generations! Yet one touch of experience breaks the spell. It is found that Jesus is only past when we refuse to think of Him. Let the question be taken up in moral earnest and at once He steps forward from the page of history, a tremendous and exacting reality. We cannot read His greatest words, be they of command or promise, without feeling that He is saying these things to us now *unter vier Augen*; that we are as much face to face with decision for or against Him as Zacchæus or Pilate. Like any other reality He can be kept out of consciousness by the withdrawal of attention. But once He has got in, He moves out of the past into the field of immediate knowledge and takes the central place in the soul here and now. It is plain that at this point a living conscience about sin is crucial. Jesus must always remain a historical externality to the man who will not admit Him to the moral sense.

Nevertheless even a historian has a conscience—the sense of unconditional and infallible obligation; hence none can be guaranteed against the risk of finding himself in the presence of One who deals with us in ways which we know to be God's ways. It may happen to any man, at any time, given the witness of a living Church, to be inescapably confronted with a Person who convicts him of moral ruin yet offers him the saving love of God. And if this should happen, he will then know, with a certainty which no history can give or take away, that in this Jesus he has touched and met with God. Here is the answer to the objection about the contingent truths of history. It is not merely that history is crammed with purpose, and nothing anywhere in it quite contingent; it is yet more em-

phatically that to call the fact of Christ contingent has no meaning. Contingent in this sense is peripheral, subordinate, adventitious; Jesus is central, vital, paramount. So far from being a chance detail of the world, He is the last and highest fact of which moral reason takes cognizance.

But to have found Jesus in history, and to have become assured that in Him we encounter God himself, are experiences which cannot fail to modify very profoundly our view of history as such. If the supreme Reality has been manifested in a person who once lived, and—experience being witness—still lives, it is clear that what happens within "the bounds of time and place" must function substantively in the plan of being. History, in other words, is not, as philosophy has so often contended, like the screen of a cinema, on which we see the moving symbols of independently real things, the symbols themselves being only shadows after all, but no true or abiding contribution to existent fact. On the contrary, it is a domain in which God is bringing reality to pass. Time and the contents of time have no merely negative relation to eternal truth; rather is supremely valid truth being freely actualized by their instrumentality. The elements of history are plastic and susceptible in the hand of God. For Him the course of the world is no external fate by which He is confronted, and with which He too must somehow come to terms; its multiplicity and mutation, with the reality of progress and movement these imply, constitute a sphere for creative action that weaves into the cosmic texture the dominating pattern of redemptive love.

History then is such that salvation may come by way of it. Humanity can be saved only from within. Even for the Redeemer Himself it was essential that redemption should be accomplished for us, not by a divine fiat, a great commanding word spoken from heaven, but by a life being lived and a death died within the world and as real parts of the time-series. And this was the lot appointed for Jesus. He too learned obedience by the things that He suffered; and being made perfect, He became the author of eternal salvation to all who obey Him.

We can perceive that any redemption which is to be apprehensible to men must be historically conveyed, since it is obviously incidental to human life as such to be constituted by historical relationships. Evil and good alike reach us through the influences of the past; through persons who, whether by heredity or example, have cooperated in moulding us and for the supreme forces of religion also, if they are to possess the world, it will be natural and necessary to approach and capture the souls of men in ways similarly concrete. Now this actualizing of redemption within the phenomenal order is possible for God. Just because He is transcendent it is possible for Him to appear in time in the form of one finite spirit, while yet not losing Himself in the fatal and debasing labyrinth of multiplicity. Creation was built on lines such as to admit the influx of vast redemptive forces one day to be liberated by the divine love. In this basal sense all must recognize the Lutheran axiom *finitum capax*

infiniti—the finite can receive and assimilate infinitude. And since ideas in themselves are impotent, the Infinite One came personally as a Saviour. Abstract humanity may be saved by abstract conceptions, real men and women only by a concrete life. Love is of God, therefore God must live beside us that His love and its sacrifice may be known to created spirits and may win back their love.

E. Kenneth Lee.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. E. J. G. Rogers is Vicar of St Catherine's Church, Wigan.

The Rev. E. J. Tinsley is Lecturer in Theology at University College, Hull.

The Rev. E. Kenneth Lee is Vicar of Lofthouse, near Leeds.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MOTHER OF GOD

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

It is a matter of regret that my letter in your June issue should have been so misunderstood as to aid Mr Moss in making the sweeping statement that the Orthodox "view of tradition is incompatible with that by which Anglicans theologize and live".

In saying that the Orthodox do not mean by Tradition "authoritative statements only", I had in mind their devotional life and their experience of life in the Church, primarily that of liturgical life, as the starting-point of their theology.

The passages in the Gospels which Mr Moss seems to think that Lossky regards as contradicting the *articulated* and *expressed* tradition of the Orthodox Church are actually regarded by him as seeming to oppose the devotional practice of the Church. In a similar way an Anglican might say that our Lord's precept, "resist not evil", seems to oppose the disciplinary practice of the Church or the attitude of the Church to the use of force by the Christian state. Lossky, after pointing out the seeming opposition between our Lord's precept and the Church's practice, deals with it by an interpretation which, in the first place, fully allows the literal sense of the words of our Lord, since it is not suggested that Mary was glorified before the coming of the Holy Spirit, and also, in the second place, accepts the spiritual sense of the words, since "this unique election does not separate her (Mary) from the rest of humanity and from all her fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, whether saints or sinners, whose best part she represented" (p. 31), and since her exaltation above John the Baptist is treated as the exaltation of all who are "the least in the Kingdom of Heaven" over the greatest men and women who never became Christians (p. 29). This interpretation is doubtless only possible for those who already know, sympathetically,

in their own devotional life, the traditional glorification of the *Theotokos*, but to say that it makes nonsense of "proving the tradition by the scripture" is very strong language. It is not as if a scriptural statement of fact were being put on one side as in conflict with tradition.

With the exception of the statement that Jesus Christ was "born of the Virgin Mary" (*Theotokos*) and perhaps the statement that Mary His Mother had no other child (*Ever-virgin*), there are no "dogmatic data in the strict sense of the word" in the Eastern Orthodox Mariology. Nothing else on the subject is in the acts of the Œcumenical Councils recognized by the Orthodox as Œcumenical. In other words, we are not dealing with the kind of belief which is to be imposed as a *sine qua non* of communicant membership of the Church; we are dealing with a belief which may come to people through experience of church life. It was this meaning of tradition to which I wished to draw attention. I was certainly not intending to suggest that the Mariology of Lossky was Anglican. But I do not see how one can separate from theology in any branch of the Church the approach through the mystical and ascetical tradition to the teaching and defence of devotional life and liturgical practice. In a very real sense, mystical and ascetical theology is necessarily cumulative and does not thereby become static or irreformable, for "things new and old" enter into it.

Yours faithfully,
EDWARD EVERY.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I am grateful to you for allowing me to write a supplement to Mr Every's letter. I think he and I would agree that the differences between Anglican and Orthodox theology have often been exaggerated. In particular Anglicans tend to understand the Orthodox attitude to tradition in Roman terms. We have need to study each other's position with greater patience and charity. This at least is certain: it is a characteristic concern of Anglican theology to insist that doctrines implicit in the mystical and ascetical tradition are not theologically or historically established because the Church down the ages has found them devotionally satisfying, or has woven them into the liturgy (whether or not they have been incorporated into some *corpus dogmaticum*). Such doctrines need to have their theological and historical basis investigated with the greatest freedom. Respect for truth (and, I would myself add, a right understanding of the implications of the historical incarnation) demands of the theologian that he should continually submit such doctrines to the most rigorous scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

LINCOLN THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE. BASIL S. MOSS.

CALVIN

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I am grateful to the Rev. T. H. L. Parker for his comments on my criticisms of Calvin, because I believe they illuminate an important divergence about the task of Christian theology to-day. The theologian *either* rests on a solution of theological problems already worked out (with minor adjustments to the contemporary situations) *or* seeks to achieve a new solution of the fundamental tasks of theology in the light of new aspects of man's historical experience.

Mr Parker accepts the former alternative: I wish I could too. But apart from the question of the relation of the Word of God to church history (which Calvin at least partly ignored), two events have occurred which seem to prevent a simple adherence to traditional theology. One is the bursting of the framework of the biblical perspective (as then understood) to give freedom for the development of science. The other is the immense development of our historical understanding—both of the Bible itself and the whole historical experience of mankind. It is regrettable if a theologian has to admit that theology has not mastered the resulting situation; but that seems preferable to insisting that there is a detailed theological answer.

My specific criticisms of Calvin are less important. By saying that he is provincial, I meant that for all his massiveness and power his range is narrow as compared, say, with St Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century or Dr John Baillie in the twentieth.

The fact that the theology of Calvin takes no account of the problem of honest divergencies in matters of doctrine is, I believe, not merely a question of Calvin's mental state, but involves serious discredit of the theology itself.

If any genuinely biblical theology must hold that the historical experience of mankind is pure rebellion against God, my criticism of Calvin, of course, collapses, and *sola scriptura* is right. My contention is that the Bible itself modifies this assertion by the recognition of man as God's creation and by its confidence in the fruits of Christ's redemption. Man's experience is certainly no substitute for Christ; it must be brought captive to Christ. But Christ does not ask for a total and absolute repudiation of it all.

Yours faithfully,

HUBERT CUNLIFFE-JONES.

YORKSHIRE UNITED INDEPENDENT COLLEGE,
BRADFORD.

VOCATION TO THE MINISTRY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I am not sure that the Archdeacon of Nottingham (THEOLOGY, July, 1950) has fully represented the motives of priests who combine

their ministry with secular jobs. Are the French priest-workmen, for example, designed to "help a little in relieving the parish priest of the rush which Sunday usually is for him"? Their concern, like the Archdeacon's, is rather with the gulf between clergy and people: and many Anglicans who would not like to see the French experiment reproduced in England are perplexed by the inelasticity of the Church's present methods of selection and training for the Ministry.

The method of nomination by priests, schoolmasters and other responsible layfolk is working with tragic inefficiency. Some forty per cent. of candidates thus nominated have been rejected by the Selection Boards, and many of them seem to have had little or no idea of what ordination involves. Must this waste continue? If parishes and schools are unreliable—and no revolution will be wrought by the misappropriation of Trinity Sunday—cannot C.A.C.T.M. itself run compulsory pre-selection conferences, and insist on participation by all candidates in organized study and social and evangelistic work? And if many candidates are still regarded as dubious after this more adequate preparation, cannot a surer method of testing than a three-day conference in somewhat Trollopian surroundings be devised?

Working-class candidates seem few, and those few are more than likely to be "put off" by the Selection Boards. It is noticeable that the Archdeacon, in considering part-time clergy, gives this list: "Barristers, solicitors, businessmen, etc." The official pamphlet *Training for the Ministry* describes the Lay Selector on a C.A.C.T.M. Board as "a doctor or a headmaster or a businessman or a soldier". Cannot working-class boys be made priests and kept working-class? And cannot shop-stewards and shop-owners share in their selection?

Questions such as these are frequent, at any rate among ordination candidates at Oxford. They must hinder full response to the call voiced by the Archdeacon.

Yours faithfully,

MAGDALEN COLLEGE,
OXFORD.

D. L. EDWARDS.

The Archdeacon of Nottingham writes:

Mr Edwards raises points of such complexity and importance that no short answer can be satisfactory. Three points perhaps can be made:

1. The purpose of Selection Centres is to do no more than say *Nihil obstat*. Vocation, devotion, pastoral sense, intellectual ability and general character are considered in terms of potentialities, and it is the task of the training period itself to do the real testing. Leaving aside the financial implications of compulsory pre-selection conferences, it is doubtful whether much would be gained except in assessing intellectual ability. Here I believe there is "wastage", and I have urged for some years the need of a preliminary year's educational course for those whose education has been meagre but who on other grounds might have been given a *nihil obstat*. I have believed for some time that there may be serious "wastage" here.

2. Working-class candidates are not so few as Mr Edwards seems to think, though it is probably true that the educational minimum demanded by the Church means that many are "put off" by Selection Boards. The solution to this, so it seems to me, lies in the point made above. If part-time priests are to be admitted, then of course working-class priests must be an essential part. I would here make the point that I am not against the idea of part-time priests in principle, but I am against the idea as an easy solution to the shortage in the parochial ministry. But the Church, bearing in mind the lessons of the past, has to decide whether a division of this kind within the priesthood is desirable.

3. The appointment of lay Selectors, made by the bishop of the diocese, involves the same difficulty which is apparent all through the government of the Church—namely, the inability of many men whose help would be most needed to be free at the time when they would be required. We would welcome many more shop-stewards, union officials, workers at the bench or coal-face in the Church Assembly, Diocesan Conferences, Committees of the Church, as well as at Selection Boards, but it is impossible for them to attend when required. Management is often represented on Selection Boards, and most of the laymen serving in this way are less removed from modern social and industrial problems than is sometimes imagined. Only those who serve on Boards know the well-informed sanity, sound judgment and real wisdom which the layman brings to the task of the Board.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CITY OF GOD. A study of St Augustine's Philosophy. By J. H. S. Burleigh. Nisbet. 12s. 6d.

The appearance of a new book on St Augustine's *City of God* is to be welcomed, because it is, as the author says, "a great and inexhaustible theme". The political aspects of the *De Civitate Dei* have been dealt with by Figgis in a still valuable book, and Prof. Norman Baynes has admirably summarized them in a Historical Association pamphlet under the title of "The Political Ideas of St Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*". F. Hofman has some valuable pages in his *Der Kirchenbegriff des hl. Augustinus*, Munich, 1933, and Prof. Gilson also in his *Introduction à l'étude de S. Augustin*. The literature on the subject, buried for a great part in periodicals, is large, and it is impossible to write adequately about *The City of God* unless one has acquired a sound knowledge of the whole range of Augustine's thought.

The present book is based upon the Croall Lectures delivered in New College, Edinburgh, in January, 1944, and it is an attempt to describe in outline the argument of *The City of God* with a running commentary. Prof. Burleigh gives a brief sketch of the times which provide the setting for Augustine's book, pointng out, quite truly, that the author had "no consciousness of living at the end of an era,

or even in a period of transition". His outlook on history had no room for such conceptions which belong rather to our own time. All Augustine's works had a practical end, whether they were sermons or homilies or theological treatises arising from some pressing contemporary need. And *The City of God*, which occupied Augustine off and on for some thirteen years, was no exception to this rule. It began as an apology for Christianity against the propaganda of the last representatives of the old heathendom, who took the line that the sack of Rome in 410 was a direct consequence of the forsaking of the old gods. He calls it a defence of the glorious City of God, of its pilgrim part here, and also of that other part which has attained to the stability of the place where faith is changed into sight, and patience and suffering are transformed into peace. And so we come to the famous conception of the two cities or societies, mystical bodies, not to be identified with visible Church or State, never closely defined but vividly imagined, whose course in this world gives a meaning to the temporal order quite apart from the fall or rise of empires and kingdoms and the fate of individuals or of nations. The summary treatment which, as Prof. Burleigh observes, Augustine gives to much of his history of the earthly city was perhaps justified, and it would, moreover, have been beyond his competence to do much more. Nor does he attempt a political theory applicable to the State as it has appeared in history. He had made no study of Aristotle's *Politics*, and it was to Cicero that he most naturally had recourse when he found it necessary to discuss what was essential to make a *respublica*, concluding that without the justice which gives God His due, an earthly state has only a relative validity and a relative peace. "If St Augustine contributed anything of value to the idea of a Christian state," says Prof. Burleigh, "it was the conception of a region 'beyond politics' wherein man must look for his chief good. However precious and beneficial may be the good achieved through the state, man has an eternal destiny, a citizenship in heaven, with which the state can have no concern."

For Augustine, then, the question of the ends of the two cities was the purpose to which his vast treatise was patiently directed among the mazes of detail and digression through which it proceeds; his thought was, in spite of his Platonism, fundamentaly biblical and, therefore, fundamentally eschatological. This is perhaps why it still possesses a relevance and an attraction in our own day. The world is always for Augustine under God's judgment, but it is only at the end, to quote Prof. Burleigh, that "the justice of all God's judgments in history will be made plain". And at the end of the work he comes to what was always for him the end indeed, the end which all through those years at Hippo was never far from his thoughts—"that which shall be in the end, without end", the eternal peace of the endless Sabbath.

All this and more is well brought out in Prof. Burleigh's book. He does not deal with the influence of the *City of God* as Arquillière has tried to depict it in the strange transformation of "political Augustinism", but he is not afraid to suggest that Augustine's book

is the greatest store of theological wisdom bequeathed us by the ancient Church, and contains much that is of permanent value. He ends with the suggestion that we may well be in need of a new *De Civitate Dei* appropriate to our own day.

F. J. E. Raby.

Jesus College,
Cambridge.

The Jewish People and Jesus Christ. By Jakob Jocz. S.P.C.K. 21s.

The title of this book is sufficient to commend it to the serious attention of all who are interested in Judaism and Christianity and in the relationship between the two religions. When in addition it is known that the author is an able scholar, well qualified to undertake such a study, one moreover whose family roots lie in Judaism and who has for some years been engaged in work for the Church Missions to Jews, the reader will expect to find here an important contribution to Jewish-Christian discussions. Such expectations will not be disappointed, and future workers in this field will not be able to afford to overlook this book.

The fact that a Jew, Dr David Daube, has written a short preface adds significance to the work, and is a sign of the times. Such "mutual understanding between the two faiths" may be limited to small circles of Jews and Christians, but its existence is of vital importance and its growth though slow is assured.

In his "Introductory Remarks" the author puts forward the aims of his book. They are five:

1. ". . . to investigate the deeper reasons that have led first to the separation of the Jews from Jesus Christ, and later to their complete estrangement".

2. ". . . to establish the fact of an always present Jewish element within the Christian Church".

3. ". . . to show how an essentially Jewish movement became entirely detached from its original background and assumed a non-Jewish character".

4. ". . . to give a survey of the discussion in Jewish quarters concerning Jesus of Nazareth".

5. ". . . to provide the reasons which make Jesus in the Christian interpretation impossible to Judaism".

He seeks to pursue these aims by providing an abundance of material, Jewish and Christian, ancient and modern, historical and literary, on which to form a judgment. In the main intended to be an academic study, the author at times deliberately steps aside to assert his own personal convictions. "To the Christian the Jewish refusal to see in Jesus of Nazareth the promised Messiah is *unbelief* —not Jewish unbelief, but human unbelief." "To the Church the division which separates Christianity from Judaism is only part of the division which separates the Church from the world."

The book was evidently written before the actual establishment of the State of Israel, and in any case is not primarily concerned with

political questions. But there is much here, especially in the last chapter, where the author deals with the theme "Israel and the nations", which will help those concerned, as all Jews and Christians should be, with the problems of Jewish-Christian relations, particularly as affected by the emergence of Israel in the modern comity of nations.

C. Witton-Davies.

St Davids.

Jesus the Revelation of God, His Mission and Message according to St John. By C. J. Wright. Hodder and Stoughton. 25s.

This commentary is an enlargement of the author's contribution to the trilogy *The Mission and Message of Jesus* (1937). The author explains that he now doubts the value of "symposia" of this kind. In doing so he has given us a clue to the eccentricities and inequalities of this highly priced bulky volume of 400 pages. "The day for theological and religious symposia—I state without circumlocution or evasion my own conviction—is about over for the time. Let each to-day say what he sees in his own way, and without looking over his shoulder for agreement or applause or consolation. It is thus that Christian truth will be advanced in this and the coming generation" (p. 13). Of the incongruity of such a confession with the give and take in the community of sacred scholarship much might be said. At least it indicates that the writer is on the defensive, a personal defensive. Of an earlier book of his own on the same subject (1933) he says: "I have been convinced, and with increasing assurance, of the main conclusions there and then expressed".

The commentary professes to be a modern liberal interpretation of the purpose, provenance, authorship and Christology of the Gospel. In spite of the commentator's declaration of independence just quoted, he owes a good deal more to other writers on the subject than he himself is aware. At the same time he holds that the author of the Gospel presupposes a knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels on the part of his readers: "has himself read all the other three Gospels", "has felt himself free to alter the details of the narratives". This naïve and superficial statement will hardly satisfy a modern intelligent reader. He ignores Mr Gardner Smith's important book *St John and the Synoptic Gospels* except in the bibliography, where the title is misquoted. The hypothesis of pre-literary traditions collected by Mark and supplemented by the same kinds of tradition in Matthew and Luke which might overlap at cerain points the quite distinctive collection of material made by the Johannine writer, is never envisaged at all.

Recognizing, however, the creative authorship of the Fourth Evangelist, Dr Wright pursues throughout a "psychological exegesis" of his mind, ascribing to him with profusion qualities such as genius, mystic, "a unitive mind", dramatic power, but developing the ideas in a very woolly fashion. His is also an "allegorical" mind. A closer acquaintance with Philo's use of allegory should have enabled the writer to distinguish this from the Johannine symbolism.

The latter is akin to the symbolism of the O.T. prophet which discloses a Divine meaning and purpose revealed in the historical process of the nation's history. The Fourth Evangelist sees in the whole personality and career of Jesus Messiah and Son of God, the eternal love and power of God perfectly revealed, the climax of all history. In the Johannine idiom, the upper world of "truth" thus makes itself visible and intelligible on "this bank and shoal of time". The most striking example is the utterance of Caiaphas in xi, 49-52. The all-embracing symbol or "sign" is Jesus, the Word made flesh, the supreme redemptive Act of God in history.

Here and there, out of a thicket of verbiage, this conception finds faint expression. The fatal defect of this book is that the reader can never escape from the commentator. On almost every page we find the author at our side, as it were a self-constituted guide. As often as not, he bursts into quotations from poets and prose writers which are rarely relevant. Here he reminds us of Warde Fowler's *bon mot*, in this connexion. He acts like a man who possesses many excellent pictures but does not know where or how to hang them. At other times he is uttering praises of the evangelist in a turgid style. "The most relevant document ever written on the issues of Thought and Unity now confronting mankind everywhere" is one of many similar "blurbs". His attempt to give a portrait of the historical Jesus in this Gospel surrounded by His rabbinical enemies (pp. 60-64) is sheer melodrama. "None could put Jesus in his pocket—for abuse, or for use," is the barely intelligible language of slang. At other moments he is warning us against "dogmatic theologians" or talking scornfully of "the myopic ingenuity" of "clever" partition theories of the Gospel's literary construction. This is unkind inasmuch as some such theorists have now "received their sight". To separate the ore from the dross in this book will be for most readers a wearisome task.

R. H. Strachan.

Cherry Hinton.

The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers. By Thomas F. Torrance. Oliver and Boyd. 12s. 6d.

This book is a dissertation approved by the University of Basel for the Doctorate of Theology: in the preface the author acknowledges particularly the help received from Professors Karl Barth, Oscar Cullmann and Karl Ludwig Schmidt. In an introduction Dr Torrance surveys the conception of Charis in Classical and Hellenistic Greek, in Philo, in the LXX and in the New Testament. Seven chapters are devoted to the various "Apostolic Fathers", and the results of the investigation are summed up in nine concluding pages.

It has long been recognized that the Apostolic Fathers represent a declension in power from the authors of the books of the New Testament. Gwatkin, for instance (*Early Church History*, I, p. 98), contrasted "the creative energy of the apostolic writers and the imitative poverty of the subapostolic". It will not therefore be surprising if Dr Torrance shows clearly that all the Apostolic Fathers—

even Ignatius—fall short of the conception of Grace which St Paul set forth, and which is implicit, if not explicit, in a considerable part of the rest of the New Testament. They do not, like St Paul, apprehend God's "deed of decisive significance that cut across human life and set it on a wholly new basis grounded upon the self-giving of God" (p. 133).

The obstacles to such an apprehension were serious and genuine, as Dr Torrance points out in his concluding pages (if we may consider these first). The influence of the LXX, "in which we have the break-up of some of the leading ideas of Hebrew revelation", the erection of the Gospel into a new law, the emphasis on repentance, and Hellenistic naturalism, all were opposing factors. Yet there is more to be said. It is unlikely that it fell to the lot of many to have a spiritual experience like St Paul's, and where such an experience is wanting it is excusable if the Pauline conception of Grace is also wanting. Clement of Rome is of course a good example. He uses Pauline phraseology without understanding its meaning. Nor were most of the Apostolic Fathers theologians. They were simply men facing a situation in which "works" were all-important. They may treat Christianity as a law, but it is not the same law as that against which St Paul protested. It was by their works that Christians lived down their bad reputation in the second century.

Nor should we suppose that the Apostolic Fathers put into their "occasional pieces" all that they knew of Christianity. They are not writing treatises on Grace, and while their written remains give the appearance of a failure to grasp the significance of the death of Christ, participation in the Eucharist must surely have sometimes conveyed some inkling of meaning even to their feeble intellects. (The Eucharist in the *Didache* is not really apposite, as the date and provenance of this work are quite uncertain.) In any case, we are left with an unresolved paradox if we regard the Christianity of the Apostolic Fathers as inferior, for in no period of history did Christianity make greater progress. We may note also that Clement, Ignatius and Hermas all regard themselves as inspired by the Spirit. Is this claim justified?

An immense amount of work has gone to the making of this book, and it is all to the good that we have in Britain a scholar who has devoted so much care to the study of this group of Christian writers. But the way in which the book is arranged makes it one of which the reading is not to be lightly undertaken. This is not written by way of disparagement; but it is just as well to point out that the great amount of exegesis of the Greek text does not make this a book for the many. The form of each chapter, in which an exegetical section follows a general account, makes for repetition. It would have been better if the two sections of each chapter had been welded together. And sometimes the weight of exegesis imposed on—*e.g.* Ignatius—is too great, especially as Dr Torrance himself fully realizes "the fragmentary nature of Ignatius' thought" (p. 74). The section on Philo in the introduction should follow and not precede that on the LXX because the latter is presupposed in the former—*e.g.*, the

Hebrew *hen* first appears on p. 8, but it is not explained till p. 11. Like the material in other sections of the introduction, the use of *charis* in Classical and Hellenistic Greek has been previously worked over by others; Dr Torrance omits consideration of Aristotle, *Rhet.* II 7, which Moffat discussed on pp. 25-26 of his *Grace in the New Testament.*

In a work in which footnotes play an important part it is hard to distinguish any principle which determines whether a statement appears in the text or in a note. References to modern works are not faultless—*e.g.*, Professor W. Manson's essay on *Grace in the New Testament* is mentioned several times, but one is not told where it can be found. (It is in *The Doctrine of Grace*, ed. W. T. Whitley, 1932.) On p. 64 n. 2, for *Magn.* 1. 1 read *Magn.* 1. 2; on p. 76 n. 9, for *Eph.* 6. 2 read *Eph.* 3. 2.

Misprints have been noted on p. 5 n. 4, pp. 9, 73, 77, 122: also in Greek on pp. 50, 52, 91. In the index "Mackinnon" is an absentee and "A. Robinson" represents two different persons.

CAMBRIDGE. J. STEVENSON.

AQUINAS AND KANT. THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE MODERN SCIENCES. By Gavin Ardley. Longmans. 18s.

It is widely held, though not by Thomists, that the Thomist-Aristotelian metaphysics have been discredited by modern natural science. It is widely held also—and here most Thomists would agree—that Thomism and Kantianism are fundamentally opposed from start to finish. The writer of the book now under review would dissent from both these opinions; for him Kant provides precisely the suggestion that is needed in order to co-ordinate the outlook of modern science, and in particular of modern physics, with the *philosophia perennis.*

Mr Ardley takes as his starting-point the view of physics adumbrated by the late Sir Arthur Eddington in his *Philosophy of Physical Science*, the doctrine of selective subjectivism. For this view "the laws of physics are subjective, arbitrary, conventional, dogmatic and authoritarian", they are "not the laws of Nature but the laws of the physicists". "A law of physics is not something discovered in Nature, but something imposed on nature"; the physicist stretches or chops down the real world to fit the Procrustean bed of his categories. Physics is *nomos*, not *physis*, and it would be more accurately called *nomics* than *physics*. In fact, the physicist when he examines and describes the world is doing what Kant thought the mind did in every act of perception, he is manufacturing the world with which he is concerned by imposing categories upon reality. Metaphysics, on the other hand—and for Mr Ardley this means the metaphysics of Aristotle and St Thomas—is concerned with reality itself, it is *physis* and not *nomos*. Kant, of course, was wrong about this, for he thought that all human experience treated the world with the Pro-

crustean brutality of physics; but if we realize that physics is Kantian while metaphysics is not we shall see that there cannot be—or, at any rate, ought not to be—any conflict between physics and metaphysics.

There is one further leading feature of Mr Ardley's exposition which needs to be emphasized. For Kant, and also apparently for Eddington, the Procrustean and synthetic character of the world of our physical experience is due to an innate and entirely involuntary functioning of the human mind, a functioning which, unless we are Kantian philosophers, we shall not even recognize as taking place at all; although the world of our experience is something that we have worked up into the shape in which we experience it, we are quite helpless in the matter; we must experience it in the Kantian categories or we cannot experience it at all. For Mr Ardley, on the other hand, the laws of nature are quite arbitrarily imposed by physicists in order to subject the world to their control; there is nothing inevitable about them. "The laws of physics," he tells us, "are *a priori* synthetic propositions, but not *a priori* and synthetic judgments of the understanding." And in consequence they have no metaphysical significance at all.

There is a great deal in Mr Ardley's book which is of the greatest interest and value. He has some very penetrating things to say about both modern philosophy and modern natural science. And he is thoroughly well acquainted with the writings of other contemporary thinkers, such as Maritain and Whittaker, who have attempted to reconcile modern science with Thomism. But I cannot feel that he has really substantiated his main assertion. Philosophers of science have, of course, in recent years come more and more to recognize the extent to which the physical scientist selects from the universe those features in which he is interested and the extent to which he imposes his own canons of interpretation upon them. But I do not think that his activity is quite as arbitrary as Mr Ardley suggests. After all, even Eddington was a *selective* subjectivist, not a *constructional* subjectivist. If Mr Ardley is right it would seem to follow that the scientist never *discovers* anything about the universe at all, he merely manipulates it; science is not in fact *scientia* at all, or if it is it is merely *knowing how* to do things and is never, even on the most superficial level, *knowing what* things are. There seems to me to be much more truth in Maritain's discussion in his great work *Distinguer pour unir*, and I notice that Mr Ardley himself gives it definite, though qualified, praise. But even if he has failed to make his case completely and has in fact over-stated it at the start, Mr Ardley has certainly called attention to a feature of modern science which has been widely ignored by most of those who, whether as professional philosophers or professional scientists, have discussed its relation to metaphysics, and it is much to be hoped that we have not heard the last of him on the subject.

E. L. Mascall, O.G.S.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

Introduction to Berdyaev. By O. Fielding Clarke. Geoffrey Bles. 15s.

Fore-Dawn. By Nicodemus. Rockcliff. 10s. 6d.

These two books are of very different manner, quality and importance. But both come within the range of the modern literature of existentialism. The first will help towards the understanding of that greatly abused word; the second is, so far as I can see, more hindered than helped by it, despite the author's careful note as to his intention in using it as deriving "in my contact with the life I know, a meaning for the life I live". And while there is value in his comment that a meeting with "an otherness or an other . . . is the primary existential experience which I know", and that this makes nonsense of the dogmatic atheism of the fashionable modern existentialism of Sartre and others, it is curious how very little is added to his message by his use of the word. For there is in fact no thinking at all except in the setting and terms of the life we know, and no meaning unless it is a meaning capable of reference to that life. From Kierkegaard onwards the word existential has been a sheer nuisance, used by a succession of writers with various shades of implication, and it is quite extraordinary to note how often it can be omitted from any given sentence with no loss to the sense, and often, indeed, to its clarification.

That, it may be, is only an expression of a private annoyance with a word which I very much dislike, and which I have disliked ever since I tried to discover its meaning in Kierkegaard's prophetic but unphilosophical writings. It is not an expression of annoyance with these two books, admirable in very different ways. I need not say much about *Fore-Dawn*, except that those who read and drew inspiration from *Midnight Hour* will find here a series of reflections or meditations quieter in tone but no less profound in insight than the disturbed and disturbing intimacies of that earlier work. It is a book not for study but for quiet and occasional reading, at times when there is leisure to listen to its undertones and its message, expressed in its title, of a hope as yet unborn. And it is at every point beautifully written.

Mr Clarke's *Introduction to Berdyaev* is quite a different matter. It is a scholar's account of one of the greatest of our modern prophets, a prophet who, unlike most of his kind, was also a philosopher, with a philosophy as far-reaching for action as for thought. It is also a testimony from one who has known Berdyaev not only as a writer, but as a friend to be interpreted to the world. The result is a book for which many of us will be grateful. Few of us have the time or training to appreciate the background of thought within which Berdyaev's life and mind took shape. Mr Clarke has given us not only a sufficient personal biography, but a general survey of Russian thought and literature, tempered, without any loss in presentation, to our very different Western modes of thought. I have felt indeed, in reading his book, that its most striking quality is the extent to which he has himself entered into the spirit and quality of the Russian mind.

But Berdyaev himself was one of those rare thinkers who, while wholly of his own tradition, rose above it to become the property of us all. His philosophy, which in spite of his occasional use of the term existential he preferred to call personalist, has gone out to the world in many languages, and has almost equal affinities with the Eastern understanding of Manhood, humiliated and made divine in Christ, and the Western mysticism which comes down through Eckhart and finds its profoundest symbolism in the *Urgrund* of Boehme, a conception which Berdyaev correlates with the primal freedom without which Creation itself could not have been.

The second part of Mr Clarke's book is an admirable and concise introduction to Berdyaev's thinking, and many of us, who have been inspired by one or other of Berdyaev's books, will now go back to them with an enriched understanding and read them again to our profit.

L. W. Grensted.

Oxford.

The Essentials of Indian Philosophy. By M. Hiriyanna. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

Some years ago Mr Hiriyanna published a similar introduction for university students which was well received. This present, shorter volume is intended for the general reader, but it may also be recommended for the use of students. The hospitality of the Hindu mind and the consequent rich variety of Hindu thought make it difficult to provide an introductory survey which sees the wood as well as the trees. Mr Hiriyanna succeeds in this difficult task better than most. A valuable feature of the book is the informative elucidation of basic terms such as *dharma* and *mokṣa*.

His judgments at times challenge attention. In a useful chapter on the transition from early Vedic thought to the period of schools and systems, for example, he remarks that "none of the Indian systems is finally pessimistic; and the common view that they are mostly 'gospels of woe' is entirely wrong". Fundamental to them all, he considers, is the belief "that the evil of *samsāra* carries with it the seeds of its destruction", while such terms as *sat* (the "real" which is also the "good") and *bhavya* (meaning not only "what will happen in the future", but also "what is auspicious") indicate the optimistic view that the best is yet to be.

The realization of this best that is to be, however, depends, according to most Hindu thinkers, on self-effort. "We alone are in the long run accountable for whatever happens," for the law of karma means that, through successive re-births, what we sow, we must reap. Concerning the effect of this belief in karma on the Indian attitude to life, the author remarks: "The law of karma . . . is essentially ethical. It is this conviction that there are in reality no iniquities in life which explains the absence of any feeling of bitterness—so apt to follow in the wake of pain and sorrow—which is noticeable even among common people in India when any misfortune befalls them

They blame neither God nor their neighbour, but only themselves for it. In fact, this frame of mind, which belief in the karma doctrine produces, is one of the most wholesome among its consequences." Belief in karma, however, does not result in fatalism, observes Mr Hiriyanna. Rightly understood, the doctrine implies both necessity and freedom, and "it is grounded in a moral view of the universe, and . . . therefore commits man to the obligations of a truly moral life".

This reference to his discussion of one of the central doctrines of Hinduism may serve to indicate the author's general approach to his subject. While, in the main, he concentrates on a straightforward exposition, not confusing the reader by needless debates, he adds from time to time comments which show that he has in mind criticisms of Hindu teachings which have been made in the past and difficulties which may still present themselves to outside observers. His book provides a useful introduction which succeeds in being concise without being shallow.

R. H. L. Slater.

McGill University,
Montreal.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Journal of Ecclesiastical History. Vol. I. No. 1. Edited by C. W. Dugmore. Faber and Faber. 25s. per annum; 15s. per half-yearly issue.

We cordially welcome the appearance of this new periodical, which bids fair to become a worthy complement to the *Journal of Theological Studies*. It aims at publishing articles and reviews on the same level of technical scholarship, and is assured of the co-operation of ecclesiastical historians of every allegiance and not only of British nationality. This first number contains ten articles ranging from "The New Testament Basis of the Doctrine of the Church," by Professor T. W. Manson, to "The Election and Inthronization of William Wake as Archbishop of Canterbury," by Professor Norman Sykes, and concluding with a comprehensive bibliography of recent work on "The Byzantine Church," by Professor N. H. Baynes. The general reader will probably find Mr T. M. Parker's "Was Thomas Cromwell a Machiavellian?" the most interesting. There are five book reviews, including one of Lockhart's life of *Cosmo Gordon Lang*, by Dr E. F. Jacob, who is the chairman of the *Journal's* advisory committee.

A. R. V.

The Breaking of Bread. By John Coventry, S.J. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

This is a popular exposition for the intelligent R.C. layman of the liturgical reason why. It consists of a commentary on the service of Low Mass, partly by means of a scholarly and attractively written

historical explanation and for the rest by a series of superb photographs of the priest and server in action. One is unfortunately left with the impression that the presence of anyone else in the church would be an irrelevance, if not a disturbance. This is certainly not what the author intends to teach, though he makes very perfunctory reference to the communion of the people. However, technically the whole production is a masterpiece. Anglicans should certainly take note.

WELLS. J. A. T. ROBINSON.

THE ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By T. G. Jalland. Hutchinson's University Library. 7s. 6d.

The first part of this book contains a study of the Jewish background to the organization, ministry and sacraments of the Christian Church: the basis is mainly Schürer and Sukenik. The second part contains a study of the organization, ministry and sacraments of the Church before Constantine: the basis is mainly Dom Gregory Dix. Dr Jalland follows fairly closely the views of Dom Gregory as published in *The Shape of the Liturgy* and the essay in *The Apostolic Ministry*. We need a unifying survey of this development in ecclesiological theory from synagogue to church. Dr Jalland's survey will be found useful.

Much of the Jewish evidence is derived from documents later than the origins of the Christian Church: and the use of this evidence depends upon a bet that Jewish practices of a later age descend at least from the first century A.D. This bet is often a reasonable one. Dr Jalland is inclined to sound a little over-confident about it: he identifies *chaburah* with *koinonia*, for example, on p. 62, so closely that the one can be put in brackets after the other.

Dr Jalland's view of the historical development of the ministry is broadly the view proffered in *The Apostolic Ministry*. Here we meet the desire for a late date for the *Didache*—indeed, Dr Jalland wishes to remove all serious weight from the *Didache* by supposing that it depicts nothing that ever existed but "a wholly imaginary Church order". Here we have a vigorous attack upon any theory of parity between bishop and presbyter in the Pastoral Epistles—"it would appear then that so far from his passage in Titus (i, 5-7) providing support for the equation presbyter=*episkopos*, it actually denies it". Here we greet, with a happy sensation of familiarity, our old friend the *shaliach*. Here we have the assertion that the apostolate continued after the death of the apostles and that the appointment of the successors of the apostles was not "left in the hands of the local church".

The assault upon the evidence is not wholly one-sided in a traditionalist sense. Dr Jalland is freely prepared to allow that monepiscopacy was "probably" not established in all churches at the same date: or that the evidence for infant baptism is tenuous and doubtful until the third century. The sad thing is that parts of the book give an impression of pleading a case. Lightfoot and C. H. Turner

owe their still living influence to their ability to rise above the prejudices of reforming and counter-reforming controversies and treat the evidence dispassionately. There are moments when Dr Jalland writes like a Laudian divine facing a Calvinistic battery of Prynnes and Bastwicks.

OWEN CHADWICK.

TRINITY HALL,
CAMBRIDGE.

TRAITS OF DIVINE KINGSHIP IN AFRICA. By P. Hadfield. Watts and Co. 8s. 6d.

BISHOP SHANAHAN OF SOUTHERN NIGERIA. By John Jordan. Clonmore and Reynolds. 16s.

ONCE DARK COUNTRY. By A. W. Lee. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Mr Hadfield has read an enormous number of books, of all sorts of dates. He has produced a volume which is little more than an elaborate index. I cannot conceive any purpose that it will serve.

The other two books are accounts of missionary work, the one about a Roman Catholic, the other by the Anglican Bishop Lee, late of Zululand. Bishop Shanahan must have been a great man, enthusiastic, indomitable, persuasive; possessing, indeed, most of the characteristics of a certain kind of stage Irishman. A childlike simplicity and directness, together with vivid narrative gifts and a remarkable power of homely illustration, enabled him to accomplish an astonishingly fruitful missionary work. But the greater one's admiration for the man the more one laments that he taught what he did. There are things here profoundly shocking to anyone who believes in the Gospel of the Bible, the Apostles, and the Primitive Church. This, for example, "I remained in that station for about two weeks, and during all that time there was perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. . . . When the canoe moved to the bank for me to step in to depart, my poor people threw themselves on their knees. 'Stay with us, Father,' they cried. 'You brought us our Lord, how can you take Him from us?' . . . I could hear their voices from the bank as we turned into mid-stream, 'Come back again and bring our Lord'. . . . It was a long time before a priest did eventually go back, but when he arrived he was met by a huge concourse of people, clapping their hands and cheering because God was coming back to them." There are other passages which make one fear that for the native paganism was substituted a paganism of Rome.

The sub-title of Bishop Lee's book is "recollections and reflections of a South African Bishop"—a somewhat flat description of a remarkably readable book. The bishop has a witty and economical style, and there is not a dull paragraph. The book is full of good stories, and even if you have no interest in Zululand you will find yourself enthralled by its bishop. For anyone who desires to understand South Africa and its peculiar problems, the bishop's reflections are worthy of attention. He is a shrewd and impartial judge. There is none of that sentimentalizing over "our black brothers" which can

be so harmful: he recognizes their failings as well as their virtues. He is equally fair to the white people.

There is no easy solution to this country's problems, and Bishop Lee offers none. His closing words at once uplift one with hope and fill one with despair because his vision is so desirable, yet unattainable because so little desired. "When the sincerity of conviction and the steadiness of purpose which are the characteristics of the Afrikaner (that is, he whom, years ago, we should have called the Boer) unite with the political experience of the Englishman, with his genius for evolution rather than for revolution, and these two great gifts are joined with the true democracy of the African, there will no longer be any doubt of the ability of the Union of South Africa to grow into a major factor in the new era into which the post-war world is entering. Under God—quite literally under God—South Africa will go forward."

Whether a good missionary book is wanted, or a good book on South Africa, or a piece of good writing, or a book for reading aloud in retreats, I recommend *Once Dark Country*.

St Paul's College, Grahamstown. F. C. Synge.

The Sacristan's Manual. By Denis G. Murphy. Burns Oates. 10s. 6d.

The great value of this book lies in the fact that it is written by a priest well aware that, "especially in smaller churches, the priest himself performs the duties of Sacristan". Very reasonably priced, it is a mine of information.

For those Anglicans who have found Fortescue of value, this book will be a fitting companion. The author seeks to explain the requirements for the Ceremonies of the Roman Rite, rather than describe the Ceremonies themselves, which already has been done adequately.

The book is divided into eight chapters, beginning with "The Care and Requisites of the Church and Sacristy". Probably the first five chapters will be of most practical interest. In a book intended for ready reference it is inevitable and desirable that there should be a good deal of repetition, but the instructions about water in the Font on pp. 61-2 amount to tautology. Also, it is rather surprising to find no reference at all to the Communion of the Sick and to Extreme Unction.

The requirements for Pontifical Ceremonies, especially those for the Consecration of Churches, cannot fail to intrigue anyone with a taste for these things. It is fortunate, however, that there is an excellent glossary at the end of the book; otherwise, even a priest Sacristan might be uncertain where to procure "Vimps for Familiars".

In addition to the glossary there are three Appendices. Those on ecclesiastical dress, titles and modes of address are taken from the Catholic Directory. They complete an excellent book, which should have both a practical and an academic interest for all who are interested in Liturgical functions.

Tunbridge Wells. B. M. Oman.

CHRISTOLOGIE: ERSTER BAND. By Heinrich Vogel. München, Chr. Kaiser Verlag. DM. 26.

The present reviewer will not pretend to have found time to work through the whole of this book of 477 large and crowded and sometimes difficult pages. Yet the volume is but the first half of the treatise on Christology upon which Professor Vogel has been engaged for a good many years. After extensive prolegomena, it carries the treatment of Christology on to the point of a full discussion of the meaning of incarnation, and of the humanity of Christ, but we must await the second volume for a discussion of the divinity and work of Christ, and also for the index which is so needful for the study of such a treatise.

Professor Vogel was one of the stalwarts of the Confessional Church in Hitler's Germany. And it was in the theological seminary illegally started in Berlin in those days by that section of the Church that he originaly elaborated the theological material which he has since the armistice been giving in lectures in Berlin University (meeting in a side-chapel of the half-ruined cathedral), and which is now appearing in book form.

The book is in the Lutheran tradition, and frequently quotes the early Lutheran divine Johann Gerhard. But it is also very much a book of the present time. It shows the influence of Kierkegaard, and still more of Barth. It is very much a book of "the confessing church", and it is very biblical. (It devotes over sixty pages at an early stage to an exposition of the first eighteen verses of the Fourth Gospel.) In various ways it shows its concern with the questions that are actively exercising theology to-day. For example, it has a long discussion of the nature of paradox in theology, distinguishing the paradoxical radically from the irrational. Again, it is deeply concerned with the endeavour, so characteristic of our time, to return to a fuller use of the Old Testament, to link the Old Testament closely with the New, to read each in the light of the other, to take Old Testament prophecy seriously, not in a pre-critical but in a post-critical way, and without any of the crudities of the idea of (as Vogel puts it) "a kind of supernatural clairvoyance" of the future. But I should find it hard to judge how far this difficult part of the book is successful.

The work is hardly likely to be read by many readers of this Journal (though Vogel's little book *The Iron Ration of a Christian* became well known) or to be translated into English. But it is certainly a significant book for the serious student who wishes to understand the varieties and tendencies of Protestant theology on the Continent to-day. And it is not dry-as-dust, but very much alive with conviction.

D. M. BAILLIE.

ST ANDREWS.

NOTE.—An exhibition of religious books will be held from October 7 to 14, 1950, under the auspices of the Publishers' Association in the Great Hall, Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

CORRECTION.—A line was unfortunately omitted at the end of the letter from the Rev. P. A. Welsby on pp. 303 f. of the August number of THEOLOGY. The last two sentences of his letter should have read as follows: "Nevertheless I think it ought to be said if we are to be given a true picture of what happened. In view of the foregoing evidence the Revised Prayer Book can only be called a 'Bishops' Book' with certain important qualifications."

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ANGELICUM (ROME): Hyacinthe-M. Hering, O.P., *Charité d'Hier, Justice d'Aujourd'hui?* (n.p.).

AUGSBURY PUBLISHING HOUSE (MINNEAPOLIS): Olaf Moe, *the Apostle Paul* ($4.75).

BLACKWELL: E. T. Davies, *Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century* (10s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: H. G. Wood, *Frederick Denison Maurice* (10s. 6d.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: Joseph Dalby, *Christian Mysticism and the Natural World* (7s. 6d.).

DAMASCUS PUBLICATIONS (ATHENS): *Towards a Christian Civilization* (a draft issued by the Christian Union of Professional Men of Greece) (n.p.).

ÉDITIONS DE FONTENELLE (ABBAYE SAINT WANDRILLE): Louis Bouyer, *La Vie de S. Antoine* (700 fr.).

LONGMANS: J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (26s.); Anne Proctor, *The Christian Household* (2s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: T. M. Parker, *The English Reformation to 1558* (5s.); Alan Richardson, *Science, History and Faith* (6s. 6d.); T. W. Manson, *The Beginning of the Gospel* (6s. 6d.).

ROCKCLIFF: H. A. L. Jefferson, *Hymns in Christian Worship* (17s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: G. P. Fedotov (Ed.), *A Treasury of Russian Spirituality* (25s.).

SOCIETY FOR OLD TESTAMENT STUDY: *Book List 1950.* [A list of English and foreign books on the Old Testament, published during the past year, with a useful description of each. Obtainable from Prof. Davies, 3, The Dell, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol, 4s. 6d.]

S.P.C.K. (FOR CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY): W. A. L. Vincent, *The State and School Education, 1640-1660* (11s. 6d.).

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): Ernst Cassirer, *The Problem of Knowledge* (30s.).

ZWINGLI-VERLAG (ZÜRICH): Emil Brunner, *Die Christliche Lehre von Schöpfung und Erlösung* (*Dogmatik Band II*) (Fr. 21.50).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher